

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/653,169	09/01/2000	Hiroshi Sakamoto	381AS/49210	5473	
75	90 07/08/2003				
CROWELL & MORING LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP P.O. BOX 14300			EXAMINER		
			FISCHMANN, BRYAN R		
Washington, DC 20044-4300			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3618	25	
			DATE MAILED: 07/08/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES EPARTMENT OF COMMERCE U.S. Patent and Andemark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.		
				EXAMINER	
			ART UNIT	PAPER	
				25	

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Paper 23 dated 5-9-2003 requested a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). Along with the request for RCE was submitted a duplicate Information Disclosure Statement (IDS - paper 22 - dated 5-9-2003). An RCE was apparently submitted for consideration of the IDS, since a Notice of Allowability (paper 21 - dated 5/7/2003) had already been "issued" for this Application. Since Paper 22 is a duplicate of previously considered IDS (paper 20 - dated 1-31-2003), the RCE submission is improper, since nothing "new" has been submitted. Thefore, the RCE (paper 23) and the IDS (paper 22) are not considered and are improper and a Notice of improper RCE will be sent in due course. See 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant should formally request a refund for the RCE in writing.

Attachment: Inverview Summary (paper 24)

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Interview Summary

Application No. 09/653,169 Applicant(s)

SAKAMOTO, ET AL

Examiner

Bryan Fischmann

Art Unit

3618

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PT	O personnel):		
(1) <u>Bryan Fischmann</u>	(3)		
(2) William Ackerman			
Date of Interview May 22, 2003	<u> </u>		
Type: a) ☑ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applican	t 2) applicant's representative]		
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes	e) 🛮 No. If yes, brief description:		
Claim(s) discussed: None			
Identification of prior art discussed: none			
any other comments:	ed. g) was not reached. h) N/A. ral nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or -9-2003 be "canceled", as the purpose of the RCE was to		
request consideration, after allowance, of an IDS (paper 20).	22) that was a duplicate of a previously considered IDS (paper		
			
	endments which the examiner agreed would render the claims o copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is		
i) 🛛 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a seg	parate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).		
INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See Nalready been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH F	MMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has ROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE cord of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached		

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required